

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed September 6, 2007 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1-18 are rejected. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 11 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,392,673 ('673). Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andrew et al. (US Pat. No. US 6,392,673 B1). The Applicants respectfully disagree but have amended the claims to more clearly define the invention.

As amended, Claim 1 recites in part "defining resizable regions of the interface element including determining whether each of the controls within the interface element is resizable; cumulating a total score by adding a value associated with each control in a given column or row contributing its respective value to the total score for the respective column or row, the column or row being designated as resizable based on the total score for the column or row and a minimum height and width is maintained; wherein defining resizable regions of the interface element includes either ignoring a control that is a last control in its row or ignoring a control that is a last control in its column."

Claim 1 teaches novel features, such as "ignoring a control that is a last control in its row or ignoring a control that is a last control in its column." *Ignoring controls* is a non-obvious,

novel feature. In addition to ignoring controls, the determination of whether a control is to be ignored is made *in response to whether a last control is the last control in its column or row* is also a novel, non-obvious feature.

As the Specification teaches “Non-resizable controls are ignored if the control is the last control in its row or column. For example, suppose a window has three (3) rows and (2) columns. The first row of the window contains a single label in the first column. The last row contains a label in the second column, and the middle row contains an edit control which spans both columns. The first label is ‘ignored’ as there are no controls to the right of it and it is the last control in its row. Similarly, the label in the last row is ignored since it is the last control in its row. Therefore, the edit control may be resized horizontally. The same logic is applied to columns. If the control is the last control in its column then it is ignored in terms of vertical resizing.” (Specification, page 8 lines 3-11).

Since Claim 1 recites novel, non-obvious limitations that include “defining resizable regions of the interface element including determining whether each of the controls within the interface element is resizable; cumulating a total score by adding a value associated with each control in a given column or row contributing its respective value to the total score for the respective column or row, the column or row being designated as resizable based on the total score for the column or row and a minimum height and width is maintained; wherein defining resizable regions of the interface element includes either ignoring a control that is a last control in its row or ignoring a control that is a last control in its column,” Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 2-10 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.


As amended, Claim 11 recites in part “responsively to the step of dividing, dynamically determining whether the subareas are resizable based on the resizability of the controls that are at least partially in the subareas while maintaining any minimum height associated with the controls; wherein the determining whether the subareas are resizable includes either ignoring a control that is a last control in its row or ignoring a control that is a last control in its column; wherein a control is the last control in its column when there are no controls to the right of the control in its column; and wherein a control is the last control in its row when there are no controls below the control in its row” and “resizing the window by resizing the resizable subareas of the window; wherein the resizing is executed independent of ignored controls.” For at least the reasons presented above, Claim 11 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 12-18 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

